UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FIFTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records

SIXTH COMMITTEE
60th meeting
held on
Thursday, 3 April 1997
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 60th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. YAMADA (Japan)
(Chairman of the Working Group of the Whole on the Elaboration of a Framework Convention on the Law of the Non-Navigational Uses of International Watercourses)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 144: CONVENTION ON THE LAW OF THE NON-NAVIGATIONAL USES OF INTERNATIONAL WATERCOURSES (continued)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of the publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.6/51/SR.60
5 September 1997
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

97-81052 (E)

Mr. Yamada (Chairman of the Working Group of the Whole on the Elaboration of a Framework Convention on the Non-Navigational Uses of International Watercourses) took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 144: CONVENTION ON THE LAW OF THE NON-NAVIGATIONAL USES OF INTERNATIONAL WATERCOURSES (continued) (A/C.6/51/NUW/WG/L.1/Rev.1 and Add.1 and 2)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Working Group to continue its consideration of the report of the Drafting Committee (A/C.6/51/NUW/WG/L.1/Rev.1 and Add.1 and 2). The representative of the United States of America would read out his proposed new wording for subparagraph (c) of article 2, "Use of terms".

2. Mr. HARRIS (United States of America) read out the following text: "(c) 'watercourse State' means a State party to the present Convention in whose territory part of an international watercourse is situated or a Party which is a regional economic integration organization in the territory of one or more member States in whose territory part of an international watercourse is situated." He explained that he had arrived at that new formulation following consultations with a number of delegations, including that of the Russian Federation, and that it established a clear distinction between two types of parties to the Convention, namely, States on the one hand and, on the other, regional economic integration organizations; the wording was still, however, perfectly readable. He hoped that it would satisfy the Chinese delegation.

3. Ms. GAO Yanping (China) said that unfortunately the United States proposal did not allay her delegation's concerns. In order to establish a clear distinction between the "watercourse States" which were individual States and those which were regional economic integration organizations, the inclusion of both in the same paragraph must be avoided. Subparagraph (c) should be confined to watercourse States that were States, and subparagraph (d) to regional economic integration organizations deemed to be watercourse States. In addition to a definition of that type of organization, subparagraph (d) might contain a description of their rights and obligations. China could join a consensus only on that condition.

4. Ms. LADGHAM (Tunisia), who failed to see how a regional organization could be a watercourse State, proposed specifying that it was for the purposes of the Convention that such an organization could be considered a watercourse State.

5. Mr. GONZALEZ (France) referred the representative of Tunisia to the words at the beginning of article 2, "For the purposes of the present Convention". As to the concerns of the Chinese delegation, he recalled that the definition given in subparagraph (c) could not be understood as having effect outside the Convention, and that in any case the final clauses contained a provision which specified that regional economic integration organizations could participate in the Convention only in the framework of an allocation of areas of competence that would have to be determined by a declaration made by those organizations and their member States.

6. Mr. HARRIS (United States of America) pointed out that, as numerous precedents had proven, from the point of view of international law it might very well be decided, for the purposes of the Convention, to include among watercourse States entities that were not States. The new formulation which he proposed established a clear distinction between parties which were States and those which were not, in such a way as to avoid all confusion.

7. Ms. GAO Yanping (China) said that the mention of the formula "For the purposes of the present Convention" only at the beginning of article 2 was not sufficient. If a definition of regional economic integration organizations, which for the time being concerned only the European Union, was given in subparagraph (c), then their areas of competence must be specified very clearly, notably as to voting and the rights and obligations incumbent on those organizations, which would involve a review of all the other provisions of the Convention which related directly or indirectly to those competences. As time was short, her delegation suggested confining mention of that type of organization to subparagraph (d).

8. Mr. ROSENSTOCK (Expert Consultant) said he understood that the Chinese delegation was thinking of other conventions which provided for voting and so contained special provisions applicable to regional economic integration organizations. However, the draft under review did not provide for any voting. The final clauses did contain a provision concerning the number of States parties required for the Convention to enter into force, but that provision left no doubt as to the difference in status between States and organizations.

9. Mr. HARRIS (United States of America) said that an interpretative declaration could be attached to subparagraph (c) to allay the concerns of the Chinese delegation.

10. Ms. VARGAS de LOSADA (Colombia) proposed maintaining the distinction by putting a full stop after "in whose territory part of an international watercourse it situated" and then, in the same paragraph or in subparagraph (d), adding the following phrase: "when, under the present Convention, a regional organization becomes party to the Convention, it is deemed to be a watercourse State in respect of the rights and obligations provided for in the Convention when part of an international watercourse is situated in the territory of one or more of its member States."

11. Ms. GAO Yanping (China) was not entirely satisfied with the United States formulation; however, to gain time and in a spirit of compromise, she would accept it ad referendum while awaiting instructions from her Government.

12. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Working Group should adopt subparagraph (c) of article 2 ad referendum and elaborate an interpretative declaration that would address China's concerns.

13. It was so decided.

Articles 13, 17 and 18

14. The CHAIRMAN recalled that paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 17, "Consultations and negotiations concerning planned measures", had already been adopted ad referendum and that two versions of paragraph 3 existed, since the text between square brackets proposed by Portugal had not received the general approval of the members of the Drafting Committee.

15. Mr. ROSENSTOCK (Expert Consultant) explained that, to address the issue raised by Portugal, it would be enough to replace the expression "for a period not exceeding six months" at the end of paragraph 3, as the Drafting Committee had proposed, with the expression "for six months unless agreed otherwise." For the sake of consistency, it would be appropriate to make the same change in paragraph 3 of article 18 and, although it was less important, in subparagraph (b) of article 13.

16. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the part of paragraph 3 of article 17 not contained between square brackets should be adopted as orally revised, as well as the text similarly modified of subparagraph (b) of article 13 and paragraph 3 of article 18, in the latter case eliminating the text between square brackets.

17. It was so decided.

18. Mr. ISKIT (Turkey), supported by Mr. AMARE (Ethiopia), recalled that he had submitted a general reservation on the whole of the third part of the draft, and that the same reservation also applied to article 17. For that reason, he could not join the consensus, even ad referendum.

Article 20

19. Mr. MORSHED (Bangladesh), speaking in his capacity as coordinator of the informal consultations on article 20, entitled "Protection and preservation of ecosystems", said that two positions had emerged, the first in favour of keeping the word "ecosystems" and the second in favour of replacing it by the expression "maintenance and preservation of the ecological balance". Among the precedents cited by delegations, there were 11 major conventions which used the word "ecosystems" and one or two instruments which had opted for the formula "ecological balance". In order to unite the delegations divided on the matter, attention should be drawn to the solution adopted at the suggestion of the representative of Mexico with regard to article 5. That solution had allowed for the reference to ecosystems in that article to be deleted in return for keeping it in the whole of part IV. It would appear that some of the delegations most strongly opposed to the use of the word "ecosystems" would be prepared to accept it in part IV on condition that it did not appear in either the preambular section or in article 5. It might be possible for a consensus to be reached on that basis.

20. Ms. FLORES (Mexico) noted that delegations had agreed to delete the term "ecosystems" from draft article 5 on condition that it was kept in article 20. She therefore proposed that the text of article 20 should remain as it had appeared in the report of the Drafting Committee.

21. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the term "ecosystems" should also be kept in article 22 and deleted from the first preambular paragraph.

22. Mr. PULVENIS (Venezuela) said that he wished to stress that his delegation had supported the proposal of the representative of Mexico concerning articles 5, 20 and 22. His delegation was considering joining the consensus, but thought that it was important that the concept of "ecosystems" should appear in the first preambular paragraph, firstly because of the general scope of that paragraph, and secondly because the concept was taken up again in articles 20 and 22.

23. Mr. ROSENSTOCK (Expert Consultant) said that he would have preferred the term "ecosystems" to be used in all three places, but that it was essential for it to appear in part IV.

24. Mr. PRANDLER (Hungary) said that his delegation had not been consulted on the matter and that it would be prepared to accept the deletion of the term "ecosystems" from article 5, on condition that it was kept in the first preambular paragraph and in part IV.

25. Mr. WELBERTS (Germany) said that he would accept the deletion of the term "ecosystems" from article 5, on condition that it was kept in article 20.

26. Ms. GAO Yanping (China) said she found it unacceptable that the term should be kept in articles 20 and 22 after having been deleted from article 5. Furthermore, she recalled that at the time of the discussions on the text of article 20, most delegations had declared themselves in favour of replacing that term with "ecological balance". The most that her delegation would be able to accept was that the term should be kept in the preambular section.

27. Mr. DEKKER (Netherlands) said that the term "ecosystems" was used in at least 11 major international instruments, in particular the Convention on Biological Diversity, whereas "ecological balance" was less commonly used and had, furthermore, never been defined. His delegation had accepted the deletion of the term "ecosystems" from article 5 on condition that it was kept in articles 20 and 22 as well as in the preambular section.

28. Mr. BOCALANDRO (Argentina) said that his delegation had accepted the deletion of the term "ecosystems" from article 5 provided that it was used in articles 20 and 22. As a final concession, it would also be able to accept its deletion from the preambular section.

29. Mr. CHAR (India) thought that the term "ecosystems" should be kept only in articles 20 and 22.

30. Mr. SABEL (Israel) wondered whether it would be possible to combine the two expressions by talking about the protection of "the ecological balance of ecosystems".

31. Ms. BARRETT (United Kingdom) said that she shared the view of the representatives of Bangladesh and Mexico. She recalled that the delegations had agreed to delete the term "ecosystems" from article 5 on condition that it was

kept in article 20 and in part IV. Any change to article 20 would entail reopening the discussion on other articles. Her delegation attached great importance to two aspects of the protection of the ecosystem which she had hoped to see in article 6, namely, the protection of wild flora and fauna and the principle of precaution. She had only given up those aspects on the understanding that the word "ecosystems" would be kept in article 5. She was therefore unable to accept that it should also be deleted from article 20, and she supported the representative of the Netherlands in thinking that it was important that it should also appear in the preambular section.

32. Ms. LADGHAM (Tunisia) said that her delegation could make no concessions on the deletion of the term in article 20.

33. Mr. TANZI (Italy) said that the concept of an ecosystem had been clearly defined, which was not the case with regard to the expression "ecological balance". He recalled that his delegation had been among those which had suggested the insertion of "ecosystems" in article 5, and it would not accept the deletion of the term from part IV either.

34. Mr. HARRIS (United States of America) said that he supported the delegations which were in favour of keeping the term "ecosystem" in part IV. However, if the term were to be used in the preambular section, it should be dependent on the wording of that part. There was a risk of confusion, since the current wording gave the impression that the Convention was as much concerned with ecosystems as with the use of watercourses. It was, moreover, perhaps not essential that the term should appear in the preambular section, since part IV clearly underlined the importance of the protection of ecosystems; his delegation would therefore join in whatever consensus was reached.

35. Mr. ISKIT (Turkey) recalled that at the time of consultations, some delegations had been in favour of using the term "ecosystems" in all articles where it appeared in square brackets; others had been prepared to accept a compromise, particularly with respect to articles 5, 20 and 22; yet others, including his delegation, were strongly opposed to its use. In the context of international watercourses, the term applied to existing ecosystems which, in most cases, were already damaged; it ruled out, however, any future modifications thereof. His delegation would prefer to speak of the preservation of the ecological balance.

36. Mr. YAHAYA (Malaysia) said that his delegation preferred the term "ecological balance"; however, after the explanation provided by the Expert Consultant, it was inclined to leave articles 20 and 22 as they were, and to delete "ecosystems" from article 5 and from the first preambular paragraph.

37. Ms. LEHTO (Finland) said that she was in favour of keeping the term "ecosystems" in articles 20 and 22, and noted that it was also used in, inter alia, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and Agenda 21.

38. Mr. NUSSBAUM (Canada) said that he particularly supported the statements made by the representatives of the Netherlands and Italy and hoped that the term "ecosystems" would be kept in articles 20 and 22. Furthermore, the definition

given in the Convention on Biological Diversity specified that it applied to a dynamic and not static process, which addressed the concerns of Turkey.

39. Mr. MANONRI (United Republic of Tanzania) said that his delegation was not opposed to the use of the term "ecosystems" which was a very broad concept. It was more concerned about the rigidity of the obligation set forth in article 20, and suggested that the words "where appropriate" should be moved so that the text would read: "Watercourse States shall, where appropriate, individually and jointly protect and preserve the ecosystems of international watercourses". Moreover, regional economic integration bodies were likely to find it difficult to persuade all their members to accept the concepts of protection and preservation of ecosystems if those concepts were accompanied by such strict obligations.

40. Mr. CANELAS DE CASTRO (Portugal) reaffirmed his delegation's position that it was almost inconceivable not to refer to ecosystems in a convention on watercourses, for example in article 5. In a spirit of compromise, however, his delegation was prepared to agree to delete the reference in article 5 on condition that it was retained in articles 20 and 22 and in the preamble.

41. Mr. BENITEZ SÁENZ (Uruguay) said that the inclusion of such a broad concept in the convention was liable to create difficulties of interpretation and impede the implementation of the convention. If the concept had to be used, it should be included only in article 20. His delegation wished to delete the references from the preamble and from article 5.

42. Mr. CHIRANOND (Thailand) said that he supported the comments made by the representative of Malaysia.

43. Mr. PATRONAS (Greece), reverting to the question raised by the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania, said that his delegation was awaiting a response from the representative of the Netherlands, on behalf of the European Union. With regard to the term "ecosystems", his delegation supported the representatives of Finland, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, among others.

44. Mr. NABER (Jordan) said that the term "ecosystems" should be used in articles 20 and 22 and in the preamble.

45. Mr. KASME (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the term should be used in articles 20 and 22.

46. Mr. DEKKER (Netherlands) said that the European Union and its member States would not only be able to fulfil their obligations under article 20, but could also go further, since some instruments of the European Union provided for the rehabilitation of damaged ecosystems.

47. Ms. GAO Yanping (China) said that the wording of the article was not appropriate. Her delegation did not wish to explain the reasons for its disagreement again, but wished to reaffirm that it could not join in a consensus in favour of retaining the term "ecosystem".

48. Mr. HABIYAREMYE (Rwanda) said that his delegation reserved its position on the retention of the term wherever it appeared in the text.

49. The CHAIRMAN said that it seemed that the majority of the members of the Working Group wished to retain the term "ecosystems" in articles 20 and 22; he suggested that the articles should be adopted ad referendum, since the reservations which had been made had been duly noted.

50. It was so decided.

51. The CHAIRMAN said that, with regard to the title of article 12, "Notification concerning planned measures with possible adverse effects", some delegations had proposed that it should be aligned with the text of the article, so that it would read "Notification concerning planned measures with significant adverse effects" while others had proposed "Notification concerning certain planned measures"; the use of the word "certain" had given rise to objections.

52. Mr. AMARE (Ethiopia) said that it was his delegation which had proposed that the title of article 12 should be aligned with the text, and that a consensus had emerged in favour of that proposal. Thus he did not understand why the original title had to be retained, since it was inconsistent with the text of the article; the title referred to "adverse effects" while the text referred to "significant adverse effect". His delegation could not join in a consensus in favour of retaining the original title.

53. Mr. SALINAS (Chile) said that his delegation felt that the title of the article did not affect its content and that even if it was not possible to align them, there was no risk of confusion.

54. Mr. SABEL (Israel), referring to the titles of articles 13 and 15, proposed that article 12 should be entitled "Notifications".

55. Mr. HARRIS (United States of America) commended the representative of Israel for his judicious proposal.

56. Mr. LAVALLE (Guatemala) proposed, as a suggestion, "Notification concerning planned measures which may have a significant adverse effect".

57. Mr. DEKKER (Netherlands) said that it was the content of the article which mattered; his delegation fully supported the proposal made by the representative of Israel.

58. Mr. AMER (Egypt) said that his delegation did not wish to undermine the consensus but wished to maintain the text as it stood because the title should reflect the content of the article.

59. Mr. KASME (Syrian Arab Republic) said that he supported the view of the representative of Egypt; the word "significant" could be replaced by "possible".

60. The CHAIRMAN said that unfortunately it was not possible to satisfy all delegations. He suggested that the current wording should be adopted ad referendum, since the reservations which had been made had been duly noted.

61. It was so decided.

62. The CHAIRMAN, referring to the preambular paragraphs which were still pending, asked the representative of Venezuela to report to the Working Group on the consultations he had coordinated.

63. Mr. PULVENIS (Venezuela) said that the consultations had been concerned with the fifth, eighth and ninth preambular paragraphs, with the proposed amendments. He wished to thank the many delegations he had consulted for the spirit of cooperation they had shown and noted that despite the absence of consensus, some trends had clearly emerged.

64. With regard to the fifth paragraph, he said that an amendment had been proposed by the United Kingdom to replace "the" framework Convention by "a". Many delegations had accepted that purely stylistic change. Three amendments had been proposed which were mutually exclusive and there had been no real consensus on any of them: the representative of Ethiopia had proposed that the words "equitable and reasonable" should be added before "utilization"; the representative of Egypt had proposed that the term "utilization" should be made more specific by adding "taking into account all the relevant factors and circumstances mentioned in article 6, the obligation to cooperate and the obligation not to cause significant harm"; and the representative of Syria had proposed, to avoid the type of amendment proposed by the other two delegations, that more general wording should be used which would correspond to the commentary by the International Law Commission. It therefore wished to add, after the reference to the use, development, and protection of an international watercourse, "in the interests of all the parties concerned". Lastly, it was proposed that the words "optimal and sustainable utilization" should be deleted, but about one third of the delegations had been opposed. The current wording, as amended by the representative of the United Kingdom, was clearly the only wording which could be unanimously accepted.

65. The amendments were divided into two categories: those which involved deleting the eighth paragraph, and those which involved changing it so that it would read not "in accordance with applicable international law" but "subject to the applicable rules and principles of international law". Some delegations had supported that proposal but the majority still felt that it was inappropriate to include such a provision in the preamble. Moreover, the proposal to retain wording which would be more likely to win consensus, by replacing "in accordance with" by "subject to", had been rejected by many of the delegations which were in favour of including the eighth preambular paragraph.

66. It was interesting to note that only half the delegations which were in favour of retaining the eighth paragraph had been in favour of using the phrase "subject to the applicable rules and principles of law". Those delegations also preferred to delete the second part of the paragraph, namely, "and stressing their direct responsibility to take appropriate action".

67. With respect to the ninth paragraph, he recalled the Expert Consultant's suggestion that, to compensate for the deletion of the eighth paragraph, a reference to the 1972 Stockholm Declaration should be inserted in the ninth paragraph. Most of the delegations which had supported the inclusion of the eighth paragraph opposed that solution on the ground that it did not meet their needs or address their concerns. The problem concerned the relevance of referring to the Stockholm Declaration in the ninth paragraph. Some felt that such a reference was necessary, but most delegations thought that it would be confusing and that the references to the Rio Declaration and Agenda 21 would suffice.

68. In sum, the current wording of the ninth paragraph, as it appeared in the report of the Drafting Committee, was the version that seemed to have the widest support.

69. The CHAIRMAN said he understood that, in the fifth preambular paragraph, the Working Group wished to replace the article "the" with the article "a" before the words "framework Convention" and to delete the square brackets which appeared in the paragraph.

70. It was so decided.

71. Mr. SVIRIDOV (Russian Federation) said that the Working Group must revert to the question of the words "and sustainable", which appeared in square brackets.

72. Mr. AMARE (Ethiopia) said that his delegation had reservations concerning the fifth paragraph because the latter should have included a reference to "equitable and reasonable" utilization.

73. Mr. RAO (India) said that his delegation could not accept the use of the word "sustainable" in the fifth preambular paragraph or in articles 5, 6 and 7.

Eighth preambular paragraph

74. The CHAIRMAN said that the report of the coordinator of informal consultations showed that a majority of States did not wish to include the eighth paragraph, which appeared in square brackets, in the preamble, even though many delegations had expressed the opposite view.

75. Mr. ISKIT (Turkey) said that it was essential to include that paragraph in the preamble because an explicit reference to the sovereignty of States was indispensable. He therefore reserved his delegation's position.

76. Mr. SALINAS (Chile) said that he, too, felt that it was indispensable to mention the sovereignty of States and that he therefore reserved his delegation's right to come back to the issue.

77. Mr. CAFLISCH (Observer for Switzerland) said that his delegation had requested the insertion of a paragraph on the sovereignty of all riparian States, both upstream and downstream, within the limits of international law. The Swiss delegation had shown great flexibility on other issues and would have

been willing to consider a reformulation of the paragraph, or even its deletion, if the outcome of the debate on articles 5, 6 and 7 had been satisfactory. As such had not been the case, it reserved its position.

78. Ms. GAO Yanping (China) said that the eighth preambular paragraph, which appeared in square brackets, expressed an incontestable fact of international law and that she therefore could not see how anyone could oppose its inclusion. She therefore reserved her delegation's position.

79. Mr. PASTOR RIDRUEJO (Spain), Mr. AMARE (Ethiopia), Mr. HABIYAREMYE (Rwanda), Ms. KALEMA (Uganda), Ms. VARGAS de LOSADA (Colombia), Mr. BENITEZ SÁENZ (Uruguay), Mr. LAVALLE (Guatemala), Mr. ŠMEJKAL (Czech Republic) and Mr. LOIBL (Austria) said that they would have preferred to include the eighth paragraph in the preamble and that they therefore reserved their delegations' positions.

80. Mr. KASME (Syrian Arab Republic), supported by Ms. BOCALANDRO (Argentina), pointed out that, both in informal consultations and in the Drafting Committee, the majority of delegations had expressed the view that the eighth paragraph should not be included in the preamble.

81. It was so decided.

Article 8

82. The CHAIRMAN said he understood that there was no consensus on the words which appeared in square brackets in article 8. In those circumstances, if he heard no objection he would take it that the Working Group wished to delete them, so that the article would end after the words "international watercourse".

83. It was so decided.

First preambular paragraph

84. The CHAIRMAN said he understood that the Working Group disagreed on whether to retain or delete the words "and their ecosystems", which appeared in square brackets in the first preambular paragraph.

85. Mr. DEKKER (Netherlands), supported by Ms. BARRETT (United Kingdom) and Mr. CANELAS de CASTRO (Portugal), said that it was necessary to mention the ecosystems of international watercourses in the first preambular paragraph.

86. Mr. SVIRIDOV (Russian Federation), supported by Mr. YAHAYA (Malaysia), said that, since the concept already appeared in articles 20 and 22, there was no need to mention it in the preamble.

87. Mr. TANZI (Italy) said that his delegation had proposed that that concept should be introduced into article 5 and that the proposal had not been accepted. The least the Working Group could do was to mention ecosystems in the preamble, which had no regulatory effect.

88. The CHAIRMAN said that, although opinions were divided, the report of Mr. Morshed, who had coordinated the informal consultations, showed that a majority of delegations felt that the words "and their ecosystems" should not appear in the first preambular paragraph.

89. It was so decided.

90. Mr. SVIRIDOV (Russian Federation) said he regretted that the Working Group had not referred to biological resources in article 8, as the Russian delegation had proposed. The Russian delegation had also proposed an article 8 bis on observance of the State border regime; however, in view of the outcome of informal consultations on article 3, paragraph 1, it would not insist, and therefore withdrew that proposal.

91. Mr. ENAYAT (Islamic Republic of Iran) pointed out that the Islamic Republic of Iran had erroneously been listed as one of the sponsors of document A/C.6/51/NUW/WG/CRP.84, which it had never supported.

92. The CHAIRMAN recalled that, throughout the consideration of the draft articles, some delegations had expressed reservations about the use of the word "significant". That word appeared in four different expressions: "significant harm" in articles 7, 21 and 27; "significant adverse effect" in articles 12, 18 and 26; "adversely affect to a significant extent" in article 3, paragraph 4; and "be affected to a significant extent" in article 4, paragraph 2. He understood that the Working Group wished to retain that word in all of those provisions, with the reservations expressed in that regard being duly recorded.

93. It was so decided.

Article 29

94. The CHAIRMAN said he understood that the Working Group wished to replace the word "internal" in article 29 with the word "non-international", with the reservations expressed by two delegations on that point being duly recorded.

95. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.